



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/007,177	12/05/2001	Stephen Craig Dyar	5962-01-CA	5683
28880 7	590 11/18/2004		EXAMINER	
WARNER-LAMBERT COMPANY 2800 PLYMOUTH RD			YOUNG, MICAH PAUL	
ANN ARBOR, MI 48105		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			1615	
			DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/007,177	DYAR ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Micah-Paul Young	1615
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	ion appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatif the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) dated if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, I Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION.  7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reation.  1. ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	•	
<ul> <li>1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on the communication (s) filed on the commun</li></ul>	☑ This action is non-final. allowance except for formal matte	*
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 17-21 and 23-25 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 17-21 and 23-25 is/are rejected 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	vithdrawn from consideration. d.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Example 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to I  n to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan e correction is required if the drawing(	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for the a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents.  3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International.  * See the attached detailed Office action for	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in A he priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	_	
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-3)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	948) Paper No(s	summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/007,177

Art Unit: 1615

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Acknowledgment of Papers Received: Request for Continued Examination dated 07/02/04.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Claims 17-21, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined disclosures of Aguadisch (EP 0 891 769 hereafter 769) and Bar-Shalom et al (USPN 5,618,560 hereafter '560). The claims are drawn to a method of making a pharmaceutical dosage form by co-extrusion.
- 4. The '769 patent discloses a method of co-extruding pharmaceutical dosage forms where the first components comprises silicone and the second water-soluble polymers (abstract). The first composition acts as a covering for the second composition, which contains a pharmaceutical agent (pg. 5, lin. 27 56). The dosage form is co-extruded using a twin-screw extruder (figures). The operating temperature is as high as 110°C (pg. 3, lin. 26). The dosage forms are cut with a knife (pg. 6, lin. 3-14). However, the reference is silent to a cooling step.
- 5. The '560 patent discloses methods for creating extruded dosage forms with impervious outer layers and water-soluble inner cores (abstract). The dosage forms can be co-extruded (col.

Application/Control Number: 10/007,177

Art Unit: 1615

- 12, lin. 47 65). The cores are molten due to the high operating temperature of the extrusion process. The dosage forms are allowed to cool, before being cut, in order to allow for an easier and more even cut (examples).
- 6. Regarding the limitation that the dosage forms are cut with a laser, it is the position of the examiner that such a limitation does not impart patentability on the claims. Barring a showing of criticality to a laser cutting step, and a showing a patentable distinction over dosage forms cut with a laser, the claims will remain obviated by the prior art.
- 7. With these things in mind, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to add the cooling step of '560 to the co-extrusion process of '769 in order to make better cuts of dosage forms. It would have been obvious to do so with an expected result of a co-extruded, evenly cut dosage form.

#### Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17-21, and 23-35 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Micah-Paul Young whose telephone number is 571-272-0608. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-4:30 every other Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page can be reached on 571-272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/007,177.

Beominal (Manieur, 10,007,1

Art Unit: 1615

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Micah-Paul Young Examiner Art Unit 1615

MP Young

